

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| 09/755,045 | 01/08/2001 | Yutaka Katsuyama | 826.1411D3/JIM | 6748 |
| 21171 | 7590 12/29/2003 | | EXAMINER | |
| STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 | | | JOHNSON, TIMOTHY M | |
| 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| WASHINGTON, DC 20005 | | | 2625 | <u> </u> |
| | | | DATE MAIL ED. 12/20/2002 | ` / |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Anglicant(a) | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| • | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | |
| Office Action Summary | 09/755,045 | KATSUYAMA, YUTAKA | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication con | Timothy M Johnson | 2625 | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status | 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE | nely filed rs will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on | | | | | |
| | –· action is non-final. | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | • | | | | |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>16,29 and 40</u> is/are pending in the ap | plication. | | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw | wn from consideration. | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | S. () | | | | |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>16,29 and 40</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o | r election requirement | • | | | |
| Application Papers | r election requirement. | | | | |
| • | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | | |
| 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti since a specific reference was included in the first 37 CFR 1.78. a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language pro 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti reference was included in the first sentence of the company of the foreign language pro 14). | s have been received. s have been received in Application of the certified copies not received priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1190 at sentence of the specification of the certified copies not received priority under 35 U.S.C. § 120 at sentence of the specification of the certified copies not received to priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 at sentence of the specification of the specification of the specification of the specification at specification has been received to priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 at sentence of the specification has been received to the specification of th | ion No. 08/909,137. ed in this National Stage ed. e) (to a provisional application) r in an Application Data Sheet. eeived. and/or 121 since a specific | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | | |
| Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5 | 5) Notice of Informal F | (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152) | | | |

Art Unit: 2625

Claim for Priority

Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35
 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The certified copy has been filed in parent Application No.
 08/909,137, filed on August 11, 1997.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 16, 29, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bessho, 5,898,795, in view of Abe, 5,129,012.

For claim 16, a ruled line extracting apparatus, comprising a straight line extracting means for extracting information of one or more straight line patterns from an input image is provided by Bessho in at least Fig. 2, block 10, or Fig. 3, block 20, providing for an input image, and at least the paragraph bridging cols. 8-9, and the first three full paragraphs in c. 9, and at least Figs. 4-5, 7-12, 13B, and 15, where extracting is explicitly provided by Bessho. Straight line deleting means for determining whether or not to delete either of a horizontal straight line pattern and a vertical straight line pattern included in the one or more straight line patterns is provided by Bessho in at least the first two full paragraphs in c. 11, and alternately in the first two full paragraphs in c. 12.

Art Unit: 2625

Bessho does not explicitly provide for deleting the one or more straight line patterns, based on a link relationship between the horizontal straight line pattern and the vertical straight line pattern. Deleting either of a horizontal straight line pattern and a vertical straight line pattern included in the one or more straight line patterns, based on a link relationship between the horizontal straight line pattern and the vertical straight line pattern is conventional and well known, and is provided by Abe in at least F1C, blocks 328-344, Figs. 8A-8B, 9B-9C, the penultimate full paragraph in c. 2, the penultimate full paragraph in c. 3 to the first full paragraph in c. 4, the paragraph bridging cols. 4-5, and the paragraph bridging cols. 13-14. It would've been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to delete based on a link relationship between horizontal and vertical straight line patterns, with the deletion of straight lines of Bessho, since Abe also provide for detecting lines even if tilted and for the detection of lines of many types.

For claims 29 and 40, see the rejection of at least claim 16 and c. 6, lines 49-53, of Bessho for a computer readable medium implementation. See also Abe in at least the second full paragraph in c. 4.

4. Claims 16, 29, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang, 5,307,422, in view of Abe, 5,129,012.

For claim 16, a ruled line extracting apparatus, comprising straight line extracting means for extracting information of one or more straight line patterns from an input

Art Unit: 2625

image is provided by Wang in at least c. 5, lines 15-50 and lines 65-68, by extracting information of units, which can consist of border lines considered as ruled lines, and inputs an image by at least block 12 in Fig. 1. Straight line deleting means for determining whether or not to delete either of a horizontal straight line pattern and a vertical straight line pattern included in the one or more straight line patterns is provided by Wang in at least c. 5, line 30 - c. 6, line 10. Wang does not explicitly provide for deleting the one or more straight line patterns, based on a link relationship between the horizontal straight line pattern and the vertical straight line pattern. Deleting either of a horizontal straight line pattern and a vertical straight line pattern included in the one or more straight line patterns, based on a link relationship between the horizontal straight line pattern and the vertical straight line pattern is conventional and well known, and is provided by Abe in at least F1C, blocks 328-344, Figs. 8A-8B, 9B-9C, the penultimate full paragraph in c. 2, the penultimate full paragraph in c. 3 to the first full paragraph in c. 4, the paragraph bridging cols. 4-5, and the paragraph bridging cols. 13-14. It would've been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to delete based on a link relationship between horizontal and vertical straight line patterns, with the deletion of straight lines of Wang, since Abe also provide for detecting lines even if tilted and for the detection of lines of many types.

For claims 29 and 40, see the rejection of at least claim 16 and at least the paragraph bridging cols. 4-5 of Wang, where his invention can be implemented in either

Art Unit: 2625

hardware or software for a computer readable medium implementation. See also Abe in

Page 5

at least the second full paragraph in c. 4.

Contact Information

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Timothy M. Johnson whose telephone number is (703)

306-3096, or the Supervisory Patent Examiner, Bhavesh M. Mehta, whose telephone

number is (703) 308-5246.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should

be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone numbers are (703) 305-4700.

(703) 305-4750, (703) 305-9600, or (703) 305-3800, or Customer Service at (703) 306-

0377.

The Group Art Unit FAX number is 703-872-9306.

Timothy M. Johnson Patent Examiner Art Unit 2625 December 18, 2003